

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WENDY A. ARRINGTON, DENNIS J. NAGY,
DARRIN T. TUCKER, LACRACHA RANDAL,
and SONEQUA DANIELS,

Plaintiffs,

Case Number 10-10975
Honorable David M. Lawson

v.

MICHIGAN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS *IN LIMINE*

Presently before the Court are six motions *in limine*, one filed by the plaintiffs and five filed by the defendant. In this district, movants must seek concurrence in the relief requested before filing a motion or request with this Court. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a). If concurrence is obtained, the parties then may present a stipulated order to the Court. If concurrence is not obtained, Local Rule 7.1(a)(2) requires that the moving party state in the motion that “there was a conference between the attorneys . . . in which the movant explained the nature of the motion and its legal basis and requested but did not obtain concurrence in the relief sought [] or . . . despite reasonable efforts specified in the motion, the movant was unable to conduct a conference.” E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a)(2).

The parties do not state in their motions that concurrence was sought from the opposing party before filing the motions. “It is not up to the Court to expend its energies when the parties have not sufficiently expended their own.” *Hasbro, Inc. v. Serafino*, 168 F.R.D. 99, 101 (D. Mass. 1996). The parties have filed their motions in violation of the applicable rules.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the plaintiff's motion *in limine* [dkt. #95] and the defendant's motions *in limine* [dcts. #97, 98, 99, 100, 101] are **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Dated: March 23, 2012

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on March 23, 2012.

s/Deborah R. Tofil
DEBORAH R. TOFIL